

**36**

Document No.	
No Change in Class.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Declassified	
Class. Changed To:	TS S O
Auth:	HR 70-2
Date:	11-29-78 By: <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 0 20px;"> </span>

Execu.    
5-1381

LKW ADDA  
WMS

25 January 1954

File 25X1

MEMORANDUM FOR: Assistant Director for Intelligence Coordination  
SUBJECT : Control Stamps

1. First let me apologize for the long delay in answering your memorandum of 15 December 1953. However, I hesitated to send you a statement of flat objection without trying to suggest some positive solution. While I agree generally with the Assistant Director for Collection and Dissemination and the Director of Security, I believe it is possible to meet their objections although I realize experts in the field have been working on this for some time. I have been trying, therefore, to give it such personal attention as I have found time for.
2. There is no legal objection to the proposed directive; therefore, I am writing from a general point of view which Colonel White has asked me to carry on with. It seems to me that the main point at issue, whether it is recognized herein, is a reluctance of the originating offices to place confidence in the dissemination system. To my way of thinking this problem is one of proper dissemination, and the controls should be restricted to those absolutely necessary for guidance to persons responsible for dissemination.
3. It seems that what is wanted is to assure that once the dissemination is set the material go no further without permission of the originating office, which seems a perfectly legitimate desire. Is it not possible to have one basic stamp which is self-explanatory to achieve most of the points involved? As a suggestion I am thinking of a stamp which would read "FOR RECIPIENT OFFICE ONLY." It seems that this might take care of the situations in subparagraphs 4.b., 4.c., 4.d., and 4.f. Under this, if the dissemination is properly made, the receiving office would be on notice that the material could go no further without specific request and approval. This will not solve the problem in subparagraph 4.a. on Foreign Nationals and I have no improvement to offer on the stamp suggested there. In subparagraph 4.e., I believe the aim is proper, but the stamp "LIMITED" is certainly not self-explanatory and might not achieve your aim. Would it not be better to say "STAFF ONLY" or some such wording indicating the purpose of the control? I have no suggestions for improvement of the proposals in subparagraphs 4.g. and 4.h.

4. I hope the above is constructive, but in any case I am reluctant to concur unless I am assured that we have reduced this problem to its simplest and most workable terms.

/S/  
LAWRENCE R. HOUSTON  
General Counsel

cc: A-DD/A ✓